

A note on the existence of H -bubbles via perturbation methods

VERONICA FELLI *

S.I.S.S.A. - Via Beirut 2-4
34014 Trieste, Italy
e-mail: felli@sissa.it

Abstract

We study the problem of existence of surfaces in $\mathbb{R}^3$ parametrized on the sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$ with prescribed mean curvature H in the perturbative case, i.e. for $H = H_0 + \varepsilon H_1$, where H_0 is a nonzero constant, H_1 is a C^2 function and ε is a small perturbation parameter.

Key Words: H -surfaces, nonlinear elliptic systems, perturbative methods.

MSC classification: 53A10, 35J50, 35B20.

1 Introduction

In this paper we are interested in the existence of H -bubbles, namely of $\mathbb{S}^2$ -type parametric surfaces in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with prescribed mean curvature H . This geometrical problem is motivated by some models describing capillarity phenomena and has the following analytical formulation: given a function $H \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$, find a smooth nonconstant function $\omega : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ which is conformal as a map on $\mathbb{S}^2$ and solves the problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta \omega = 2H(\omega) \omega_x \wedge \omega_y, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \omega|^2 < +\infty, \end{cases} \quad (P_H)$$

where $\omega_x = (\frac{\partial \omega_1}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial \omega_2}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial \omega_3}{\partial x})$, $\omega_y = (\frac{\partial \omega_1}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial \omega_2}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial \omega_3}{\partial y})$, $\Delta \omega = \omega_{xx} + \omega_{yy}$, $\nabla \omega = (\omega_x, \omega_y)$, and $\wedge$ denotes the exterior product in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

*Supported by MIUR, national project "Variational Methods and Nonlinear Differential Equations".

Brezis and Coron [4] proved that for constant nonzero mean curvature $H(u) \equiv H_0$ the only nonconstant solutions are spheres of radius $|H_0|^{-1}$.

While the Plateau and the Dirichlet problems has been largely studied both for H constant and for H nonconstant (see [3, 4, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16]), problem (P_H) in the case of nonconstant H has been investigated only recently, see [5, 6, 7]. In [5] Caldiroli and Musina proved the existence of H -bubbles with minimal energy under the assumptions that $H \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} (i) \quad & \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla H(u + \xi) \cdot u| < 1 \quad \text{for some } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^3, \\ (ii) \quad & H(u) \rightarrow H_\infty \quad \text{as } |u| \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{for some } H_\infty \in \mathbb{R}, \\ (iii) \quad & c_H = \inf_{\substack{u \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^3) \\ u \neq 0}} \sup_{s > 0} \mathcal{E}_H(su) < \frac{4\pi}{3H_\infty^2} \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{E}_H(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u|^2 + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} Q(u) \cdot u_x \wedge u_y$ and $Q : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ is any vector field such that $\operatorname{div} Q = H$.

The perturbative method introduced by Ambrosetti and Badiale [1, 2] was used in [7] to treat the case in which H is a small perturbation of a constant, namely

$$H(u) = H_\varepsilon(u) = H_0 + \varepsilon H_1(u),$$

where $H_0 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, $H_1 \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$, and ε is a small real parameter. This method allows to find critical points of a functional f_ε of the type $f_\varepsilon(u) = f_0(u) - \varepsilon G(u)$ in a Banach space by studying a finite dimensional problem. More precisely, if the unperturbed functional f_0 has a finite dimensional manifold of critical points Z which satisfies a nondegeneracy condition, it is possible to prove, for $|\varepsilon|$ sufficiently small, the existence of a smooth function $\eta_\varepsilon(z) : Z \rightarrow (T_z Z)^\perp$ such that any critical point $\bar{z} \in Z$ of the function

$$\Phi_\varepsilon : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \Phi_\varepsilon(z) = f_\varepsilon(z + \eta_\varepsilon(z))$$

gives rise to a critical point $u_\varepsilon = \bar{z} + \eta_\varepsilon(\bar{z})$ of f_ε , i.e. the perturbed manifold $Z_\varepsilon := \{z + \eta_\varepsilon(z) : z \in Z\}$ is a natural constraint for f_ε . Furthermore Φ_ε can be expanded as

$$\Phi_\varepsilon(z) = b - \varepsilon \Gamma(z) + o(\varepsilon) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0 \tag{1.1}$$

where $b = f_0(z)$ and Γ is the Melnikov function defined as the restriction of the perturbation G on Z , namely $\Gamma = G|_Z$. For problem (P_{H_ε}) , Γ is given by

$$\Gamma : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \Gamma(p) = \int_{|p-q| < \frac{1}{|H_0|}} H_1(q) dq.$$

In [7] Caldiroli and Musina studied the functional Γ giving some existence results in the perturbative setting for problem (P_{H_ε}) . They prove that for $|\varepsilon|$ small there exists a smooth

H_ε -bubble if one of the following conditions holds

- 1) H_1 has a nondegenerate stationary point and $|H_0|$ is large;
- 2) $\max_{p \in \partial K} H_1(p) < \max_{p \in K} H_1(p)$ or $\min_{p \in \partial K} H_1(p) > \min_{p \in K} H_1(p)$
for some nonempty compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ and $|H_0|$ is large;
- 3) $H_1 \in L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)$ for some $r \in [1, 2]$.

They prove that critical points of Γ give rise to solutions to (P_{H_ε}) for ε sufficiently small. Precisely the assumption that H_0 is large required in cases 1) and 2) ensures that if H_1 is not constant then Γ is not identically constant. If we let this assumption drop, it may happen that Γ is constant even if H_1 is not. This fact produces some loss of information because the first order expansion (1.1) is not sufficient to deduce the existence of critical points of Φ_ε from the existence of critical points of Γ . Instead of studying Γ we perform a direct study of Φ_ε which allows us to prove some new results. In the first one, we assume that H_1 vanishes at ∞ and has bounded gradient, and prove the existence of a solution without branch points. Let us recall that a branch point for a solution ω to (P_H) is a point where $\nabla \omega = 0$, i.e. a point where the surface parametrized by ω fails to be immersed.

Theorem 1.1 *Let $H_0 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, $H_1 \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that*

$$(H1) \quad \lim_{|p| \rightarrow \infty} H_1(p) = 0;$$

$$(H2) \quad \nabla H_1 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3).$$

Let $H_\varepsilon = H_0 + \varepsilon H_1$. Then for $|\varepsilon|$ sufficiently small there exists a smooth H_ε -bubble without branch points.

With respect to case 1) of [7] we require neither nondegeneracy of critical points of H_1 nor largeness of H_0 . With respect to case 2) we do not assume that H_0 is large; on the other hand our assumption (H1) implies 2). Moreover we do not assume any integrability condition of type 3). With respect to the result proved in [5], we have the same kind of behavior of H_1 at ∞ (see (ii) and assumption (H1)) but we do not need any assumption of type (iii); on the other hand in [5] it is not required that the prescribed curvature is a small perturbation of a constant.

The following results give some conditions on H_1 in order to have two or three solutions.

Theorem 1.2 *Let $H_0 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, $H_1 \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that (H1), (H2),*

$$(H3) \quad \text{Hess } H_1(p) \text{ is positive definite for any } p \in B_{1/|H_0|}(0),$$

$$(H4) \quad H_1(p) > 0 \text{ in } B_{1/|H_0|}(0),$$

hold. Then for $|\varepsilon|$ sufficiently small there exist at least three smooth H_ε -bubbles without branch points.

Remark 1.3 *If we assume (H1), (H2), and, instead of (H3) – (H4), that $H_1(0) > 0$ and $\text{Hess } H_1(0)$ is positive definite, then we can prove that for $|H_0|$ sufficiently large and $|\varepsilon|$ sufficiently small there exist at least three smooth H_ε -bubbles without branch points.*

Theorem 1.4 *Let $H_0 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, $H_1 \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that (H1) and (H2) hold. Assume that there exist $p_1, p_2 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that*

$$(H5) \quad \int_{B(p_1, 1/|H_0|)} H_1(\xi) d\xi > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{B(p_2, 1/|H_0|)} H_1(\xi) d\xi < 0.$$

Then for $|\varepsilon|$ sufficiently small there exist at least two smooth H_ε -bubbles without branch points.

Remark 1.5 *If we assume (H1), (H2), and, instead of (H5), that there exist $p_1, p_2 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that $H_1(p_1) > 0$ and $H_1(p_2) < 0$, then we can prove that for $|H_0|$ sufficiently large and $|\varepsilon|$ sufficiently small there exist at least two smooth H_ε -bubbles without branch points.*

The present paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce some notation and recall some known facts whereas Section 3 is devoted to the proof of Theorems 1.1, 1.2, and 1.4.

Acknowledgments. The author wishes to thank Professor A. Ambrosetti and Professor R. Musina for many helpful suggestions.

2 Notation and known facts

In the sequel we will take $H_0 = 1$; this is not restrictive since we can do the change $H_1(u) = H_0 \tilde{H}_1(H_0 u)$. Hence we will always write

$$H_\varepsilon(u) = 1 + \varepsilon H(u),$$

where $H \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Let us denote by ω the function $\omega : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ defined as

$$\omega(x, y) = (\mu(x, y)x, \mu(x, y)y, 1 - \mu(x, y)) \quad \text{where} \quad \mu(x, y) = \frac{2}{1 + x^2 + y^2}, \quad (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Note that ω is a conformal parametrization of the unit sphere and solves

$$\begin{cases} \Delta \omega = 2 \omega_x \wedge \omega_y & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^2 \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \omega|^2 < +\infty. \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

Problem (2.1) has in fact a family of solutions of the form $\omega \circ \phi + p$ where $p \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and ϕ is any conformal diffeomorphism of $\mathbb{R}^2 \cup \{\infty\}$. For $s \in (1, +\infty)$, we will set $L^s := L^s(\mathbb{S}^2, \mathbb{R}^3)$, where any map $v \in L^s$ is identified with the map $v \circ \omega : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ which satisfies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |v \circ \omega|^s \mu^2 = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |v|^s.$$

We will use the same notation for v and $v \circ \omega$. By $W^{1,s}$ we denote the Sobolev space $W^{1,s}(\mathbb{S}^2, \mathbb{R}^3)$ endowed (according to the above identification) with the norm

$$\|v\|_{W^{1,s}} = \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla v|^s \mu^{2-s} \right]^{1/s} + \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |v|^s \mu^2 \right]^{1/s}.$$

If s' is the conjugate exponent of s , i.e. $\frac{1}{s} + \frac{1}{s'} = 1$, the duality product between $W^{1,s}$ and $W^{1,s'}$ is given by

$$\langle v, \varphi \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla v \cdot \nabla \varphi + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} v \cdot \varphi \mu^2 \quad \text{for any } v \in W^{1,s} \text{ and } \varphi \in W^{1,s'}.$$

Let Q be any smooth vector field on $\mathbb{R}^3$ such that $\operatorname{div} Q = H$. The energy functional associated to problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u = 2(1 + \varepsilon H(u)) u_x \wedge u_y, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u|^2 < +\infty, \end{cases} \quad (P_\varepsilon)$$

is given by

$$\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u|^2 + 2\mathcal{V}_1(u) + 2\varepsilon \mathcal{V}_H(u), \quad u \in W^{1,3},$$

where

$$\mathcal{V}_H(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} Q(u) \cdot u_x \wedge u_y$$

has the meaning of an algebraic volume enclosed by the surface parametrized by u with weight H (it is independent of the choice of Q); in particular

$$\mathcal{V}_1(u) = \frac{1}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} u \cdot u_x \wedge u_y.$$

In [7], Caldiroli and Musina studied some regularity properties of $\mathcal{V}_H$ on the space $W^{1,3}$. In particular they proved the following properties.

- a) For $H \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$, the functional $\mathcal{V}_H$ is of class C^1 on $W^{1,3}$ and the Fréchet differential of $\mathcal{V}_H$ at $u \in W^{1,3}$ is given by

$$d\mathcal{V}_H(u)\varphi = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} H(u) \varphi \cdot u_x \wedge u_y \quad \text{for any } \varphi \in W^{1,3} \quad (2.2)$$

and admits a unique continuous and linear extension on $W^{1,3/2}$ defined by (2.2). Moreover for every $u \in W^{1,3}$ there exists $\mathcal{V}'_H(u) \in W^{1,3}$ such that

$$\langle \mathcal{V}'_H(u), \varphi \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} H(u) \varphi \cdot u_x \wedge u_y \quad \text{for any } \varphi \in W^{1,3/2}. \quad (2.3)$$

b) For $H \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$, the map $\mathcal{V}'_H : W^{1,3} \rightarrow W^{1,3}$ is of class C^1 and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{V}''_H(u) \cdot \eta, \varphi \rangle &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} H(u) \varphi \cdot (\eta_x \wedge u_y + u_x \wedge \eta_y) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (\nabla H(u) \cdot \eta) \varphi \cdot (u_x \wedge u_y) \\ &\quad \text{for any } u, \eta \in W^{1,3} \text{ and } \varphi \in W^{1,3/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

Hence for all $u \in W^{1,3}$, $\mathcal{E}'_\varepsilon(u) \in W^{1,3}$ and for any $\varphi \in W^{1,3/2}$

$$\langle \mathcal{E}'_\varepsilon(u), \varphi \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi \cdot u_x \wedge u_y + 2\varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} H(u) \varphi \cdot u_x \wedge u_y.$$

As remarked in [7], critical points of $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon$ in $W^{1,3}$ give rise to bounded weak solutions to (P_ε) and hence by the regularity theory for H -systems (see [9]) to classical conformal solutions which are $C^{3,\alpha}$ as maps on $\mathbb{S}^2$.

The unperturbed problem, i.e. (P_ε) for $\varepsilon = 0$, has a 9-dimensional manifold of solutions given by

$$Z = \{R\omega \circ L_{l,\xi} + p : R \in SO(3), l > 0, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^2, p \in \mathbb{R}^3\}$$

where $L_{l,\xi}z = l(z - \xi)$ (see [11]). In [11] the nondegeneracy condition $T_u Z = \ker \mathcal{E}''_0(u)$ for any $u \in Z$ (where $T_u Z$ denotes the tangent space of Z at u) is proved (see also [8]).

As observed in [7], in performing the finite dimensional reduction, the dependence on the 6-dimensional conformal group can be neglected since any H -system is conformally invariant. Hence we look for critical points of $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon$ constrained on a three-dimensional manifold Z_ε just depending on the translation variable $p \in \mathbb{R}^3$.

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

We start by constructing a perturbed manifold which is a natural constraint for $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon$.

Lemma 3.1 *Assume $H \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $\nabla H \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$. Then there exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, $C_1 > 0$, and a C^1 map $\eta : (-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0) \times \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow W^{1,3}$ such that for any $p \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $\varepsilon \in (-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0)$*

$$\mathcal{E}'_\varepsilon(\omega + p + \eta(\varepsilon, p)) \in T_\omega Z, \quad (3.1)$$

$$\eta(\varepsilon, p) \in (T_\omega Z)^\perp, \quad (3.2)$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \eta(\varepsilon, p) = 0, \quad (3.3)$$

$$\|\eta(\varepsilon, p)\|_{W^{1,3}} \leq C_1 |\varepsilon|. \quad (3.4)$$

Moreover if we assume that the limit of H at ∞ exists and

$$\lim_{|p| \rightarrow \infty} H(p) = 0 \quad (3.5)$$

we have that $\eta(\varepsilon, p)$ converges to 0 in $W^{1,3}$ as $|p| \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly with respect to $|\varepsilon| < \varepsilon_0$.

Proof. Let us define the map

$$\begin{aligned} F &= (F_1, F_2) : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times W^{1,3} \times \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow W^{1,3} \times \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \\ \langle F_1(\varepsilon, p, \eta, l, \alpha), \varphi \rangle &= \langle \mathcal{E}'_\varepsilon(\omega + p + \eta), \varphi \rangle - \sum_{i=1}^6 l_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla \tau_i + \alpha \cdot \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \varphi, \quad \forall \varphi \in W^{1,3/2} \\ F_2(\varepsilon, p, \eta, l, \alpha) &= \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla \eta \cdot \nabla \tau_1, \dots, \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla \eta \cdot \nabla \tau_6, \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \eta \right) \end{aligned}$$

where $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_6$ are chosen in $T_\omega Z$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla \tau_i \cdot \nabla \tau_j = \delta_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \tau_i = 0 \quad i, j = 1, \dots, 6$$

so that $T_\omega Z$ is spanned by $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_6, e_1, e_2, e_3$. It has been proved by Caldiroli and Musina [7] that F is of class C^1 and that the linear continuous operator

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &: W^{1,3} \times \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow W^{1,3} \times \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \\ \mathcal{L} &= \frac{\partial F}{\partial(\eta, l, \alpha)}(0, p, 0, 0, 0) \end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{L}_1(v, \mu, \beta), \varphi \rangle &= \langle \mathcal{E}''_0(\omega) \cdot v, \varphi \rangle - \sum_{i=1}^6 \mu_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla \varphi \cdot \tau_i - \beta \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \varphi \quad \forall \varphi \in W^{1,3/2} \\ \mathcal{L}_2(v, \mu, \beta) &= \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla v \cdot \nabla \tau_1, \dots, \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla v \cdot \nabla \tau_6, \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} v \right) \end{aligned}$$

is invertible. Caldiroli and Musina applied the Implicit Function Theorem to solve the equation $F(\varepsilon, p, \eta, l, \alpha) = 0$ locally with respect to the variables ε, p , thus finding a C^1 -function η on a neighborhood $(-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0) \times B_R \subset \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^3$ satisfying (3.1), (3.2), and (3.3). We will use instead the Contraction Mapping Theorem, which allows to prove the existence of such a function η globally on $\mathbb{R}^3$, thanks to the fact that the operator $\mathcal{L}$ does not depend on p and hence it is invertible uniformly with respect to $p \in \mathbb{R}^3$.

We have that $F(\varepsilon, p, \eta, l, \alpha) = 0$ if and only if (η, l, α) is a fixed point of the map $T_{\varepsilon, p}$ defined as

$$T_{\varepsilon, p}(\eta, l, \alpha) = -\mathcal{L}^{-1}F(\varepsilon, p, \eta, l, \alpha) + (\eta, l, \alpha).$$

To prove the existence of η satisfying (3.1), (3.2), and (3.3), it is enough to prove that $T_{\varepsilon,p}$ is a contraction in some ball $B_\rho(0)$ with $\rho = \rho(\varepsilon) > 0$ independent of p , whereas the regularity of $\eta(\varepsilon, p)$ follows from the Implicit Function Theorem.

We have that if $\|\eta\|_{W^{1,3}} \leq \rho$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|T_{\varepsilon,p}(\eta, l, \alpha)\|_{W^{1,3} \times \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^3} \\
& \leq C_2 \|F(\varepsilon, p, \eta, l, \alpha) - \mathcal{L}(\eta, l, \alpha)\|_{W^{1,3} \times \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^3} \leq C_2 \|\mathcal{E}'_\varepsilon(\omega + p + \eta) - \mathcal{E}_0''(\omega)\eta\|_{W^{1,3}} \\
& \leq C_2 (\|\mathcal{E}'_0(\omega + \eta) - \mathcal{E}_0''(\omega)\eta\|_{W^{1,3}} + 2|\varepsilon| \|\mathcal{V}'_H(\omega + p + \eta)\|_{W^{1,3}}) \\
& \leq C_2 \left(\int_0^1 \|\mathcal{E}_0''(\omega + t\eta) - \mathcal{E}_0''(\omega)\|_{W^{1,3/2}} dt \|\eta\|_{W^{1,3}} + 2|\varepsilon| \|\mathcal{V}'_H(\omega + p + \eta)\|_{W^{1,3}} \right) \\
& \leq C_2 \rho \sup_{\|\eta\|_{W^{1,3}} \leq \rho} \|\mathcal{E}_0''(\omega + \eta) - \mathcal{E}_0''(\omega)\|_{W^{1,3/2}} + 2C_2 |\varepsilon| \sup_{\|\eta\|_{W^{1,3}} \leq \rho} \|\mathcal{V}'_H(\omega + p + \eta)\|_{W^{1,3}}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

where $C_2 = \|\mathcal{L}^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(W^{1,3} \times \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^3)}$. For $(\eta_1, l_1, \alpha_1), (\eta_2, l_2, \alpha_2) \in B_\rho(0) \subset W^{1,3} \times \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^3$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\|T_{\varepsilon,p}(\eta_1, l_1, \alpha_1) - T_{\varepsilon,p}(\eta_2, l_2, \alpha_2)\|_{W^{1,3} \times \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^3}}{C_2 \|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{W^{1,3}}} \\
& \leq \frac{\|\mathcal{E}'_\varepsilon(\omega + p + \eta_1) - \mathcal{E}'_\varepsilon(\omega + p + \eta_2) - \mathcal{E}_0''(\omega)(\eta_1 - \eta_2)\|_{W^{1,3}}}{C_2 \|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_{W^{1,3}}} \\
& \leq \int_0^1 \|\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon''(\omega + p + \eta_2 + t(\eta_1 - \eta_2)) - \mathcal{E}_0''(\omega)\|_{W^{1,3/2}} dt \\
& \leq \int_0^1 \|\mathcal{E}_0''(\omega + p + \eta_2 + t(\eta_1 - \eta_2)) - \mathcal{E}_0''(\omega)\|_{W^{1,3/2}} dt \\
& \quad + 2|\varepsilon| \int_0^1 \|\mathcal{V}_H''(\omega + p + \eta_2 + t(\eta_1 - \eta_2))\|_{W^{1,3/2}} dt \\
& \leq \sup_{\|\eta\|_{W^{1,3}} \leq 3\rho} \|\mathcal{E}_0''(\omega + \eta) - \mathcal{E}_0''(\omega)\|_{W^{1,3/2}} + 2|\varepsilon| \sup_{\|\eta\|_{W^{1,3}} \leq 3\rho} \|\mathcal{V}_H''(\omega + p + \eta)\|_{W^{1,3/2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

From (2.3), (2.4), and the Hölder inequality it follows that there exists a positive constant C_3 such that for any $\eta \in W^{1,3}$, $p \in \mathbb{R}^3$

$$\|\mathcal{V}'_H(\omega + p + \eta)\|_{W^{1,3}} \leq C_3 \left[\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |H(\omega + p + \eta)|^{3/2} |\nabla \omega|^3 \mu^{-1} \right)^{2/3} + \|\eta\|_{W^{1,3}}^2 \right] \tag{3.7}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{V}_H''(\omega + p + \eta)\|_{W^{1,3/2}} & \leq C_3 \left[\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |H(\omega + p + \eta)|^2 |\nabla(\omega + \eta)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla H(\omega + p + \eta)|^{3/2} |\nabla(\omega + \eta)|^3 \mu^{-1} \right)^{2/3} \right]. \tag{3.8}
\end{aligned}$$

Choosing $\rho_0 > 0$ such that

$$C_2 \sup_{\|\eta\|_{W^{1,3}} \leq 3\rho_0} \|\mathcal{E}_0''(\omega + \eta) - \mathcal{E}_0''(\omega)\|_{W^{1,3/2}} < \frac{1}{2}$$

and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that

$$8C_2C_3\varepsilon_0\|H\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)}\|\omega\|_{W^{1,3}}^2 < \min\left\{1, \rho_0, \frac{1}{8C_2C_3\varepsilon_0}\right\}, \quad (3.9)$$

$$\sup_{\substack{\|\eta\|_{W^{1,3}} \leq \rho_0 \\ p \in \mathbb{R}^3}} \|\mathcal{V}'_H(\omega + p + \eta)\|_{W^{1,3}} < \frac{\rho_0}{6\varepsilon_0C_2}, \quad (3.10)$$

$$\sup_{\substack{\|\eta\|_{W^{1,3}} \leq 3\rho_0 \\ p \in \mathbb{R}^3}} \|\mathcal{V}''_H(\omega + p + \eta)\|_{W^{1,3/2}} < \frac{1}{8\varepsilon_0C_2}, \quad (3.11)$$

we obtain that $T_{\varepsilon,p}$ maps the ball $\overline{B_{\rho_0}(0)}$ into itself for any $|\varepsilon| < \varepsilon_0$, $p \in \mathbb{R}^3$, and is a contraction there. Hence it has a unique fixed point $(\eta(\varepsilon, p), l(\varepsilon, p), \alpha(\varepsilon, p)) \in \overline{B_{\rho_0}(0)}$. From (3.6) we have that the following property holds

$$(*) \quad T_{\varepsilon,p} \text{ maps a ball } \overline{B_\rho(0)} \subset W^{1,3} \times \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \text{ into itself whenever } \rho \leq \rho_0 \text{ and} \\ \rho > 4|\varepsilon|C_2 \sup_{\|\eta\|_{W^{1,3}} \leq \rho} \|\mathcal{V}'_H(\omega + p + \eta)\|_{W^{1,3}}.$$

In particular let us set

$$\rho_\varepsilon = 5|\varepsilon|C_2 \sup_{\substack{\|\eta\|_{W^{1,3}} \leq \rho_0 \\ p \in \mathbb{R}^3}} \|\mathcal{V}'_H(\omega + p + \eta)\|_{W^{1,3}}. \quad (3.12)$$

In view of (3.10) and (3.12), we have that for any $|\varepsilon| < \varepsilon_0$ and for any $p \in \mathbb{R}^3$

$$\rho_\varepsilon \leq \rho_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_\varepsilon > 4|\varepsilon|C_2 \sup_{\|\eta\|_{W^{1,3}} \leq \rho_\varepsilon} \|\mathcal{V}'_H(\omega + p + \eta)\|_{W^{1,3}}$$

so that, due to (*), $T_{\varepsilon,p}$ maps $\overline{B_{\rho_\varepsilon}(0)}$ into itself. From the uniqueness of the fixed point we have that for any $|\varepsilon| < \varepsilon_0$ and $p \in \mathbb{R}^3$

$$\|(\eta(\varepsilon, p), l(\varepsilon, p), \alpha(\varepsilon, p))\|_{W^{1,3} \times \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^3} \leq \rho_\varepsilon \leq C_1|\varepsilon| \quad (3.13)$$

for some positive constant C_1 independent of p and hence $\|\eta(\varepsilon, p)\|_{W^{1,3}} \leq \rho_\varepsilon \leq C_1|\varepsilon|$ thus proving (3.4). Assume now (3.5) and set for any $p \in \mathbb{R}^3$

$$\rho_p = 8C_2C_3\varepsilon_0 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \sup_{|q-p| \leq 1+C_0} |H(q)|^{3/2} |\nabla \omega|^3 \mu^{-1} \right)^{2/3}$$

where C_0 is a positive constant such that $\|u\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_0\|u\|_{W^{1,3}}$ for any $u \in W^{1,3}$. From (3.9) we have that

$$\rho_p < \min \left\{ 1, \rho_0, \frac{1}{8C_2C_3\varepsilon_0} \right\}.$$

Hence, due to (3.7), we have that for $|\varepsilon| < \varepsilon_0$ and $\|\eta\|_{W^{1,3}} \leq \rho_p$

$$\begin{aligned} & 4|\varepsilon|C_2\|\mathcal{V}'_H(\omega + p + \eta)\|_{W^{1,3}} \\ & \leq 4\varepsilon_0C_2C_3 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \sup_{|q-p| \leq 1+C_0} |H(q)|^{3/2} |\nabla \omega|^3 \mu^{-1} \right)^{2/3} + 4\varepsilon_0C_2C_3\rho_p^2 < \rho_p. \end{aligned}$$

From (*) and the uniqueness of the fixed point, we deduce that $\|\eta(\varepsilon, p)\|_{W^{1,3}} \leq \rho_p$ for any $|\varepsilon| < \varepsilon_0$ and $p \in \mathbb{R}^3$. On the other hand, since H vanishes at ∞ , by the definition of ρ_p we have that $\rho_p \rightarrow 0$ as $|p| \rightarrow \infty$, hence

$$\lim_{|p| \rightarrow \infty} \eta(\varepsilon, p) = 0 \quad \text{in } W^{1,3} \text{ uniformly for } |\varepsilon| < \varepsilon_0.$$

The proof of Lemma 3.1 is now complete. $\square$

Remark 3.2 *The map η given in Lemma 3.1 satisfies*

$$\langle \mathcal{E}'_\varepsilon(\omega + p + \eta(\varepsilon, p)), \varphi \rangle - \sum_{i=1}^6 l_i(\varepsilon, p) \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla \tau_i + \alpha(\varepsilon, p) \cdot \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \varphi, \quad \forall \varphi \in W^{1,3/2}$$

where $(\eta(\varepsilon, p), l(\varepsilon, p), \alpha(\varepsilon, p)) \in \overline{B_{\rho_\varepsilon}(0)} \subset W^{1,3} \times \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^3$ being ρ_ε given in (3.12), hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla(\omega + \eta(\varepsilon, p)) \cdot \nabla \varphi + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi \cdot (\omega + \eta(\varepsilon, p))_x \wedge (\omega + \eta(\varepsilon, p))_y \\ & + 2\varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} H(\omega + p + \eta(\varepsilon, p)) \varphi \cdot (\omega + \eta(\varepsilon, p))_x \wedge (\omega + \eta(\varepsilon, p))_y \\ & = \sum_{i=1}^6 l_i(\varepsilon, p) \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla \varphi \cdot \nabla \tau_i - \alpha(\varepsilon, p) \cdot \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \varphi, \quad \forall \varphi \in W^{1,3/2}, \end{aligned}$$

i.e. $\eta(\varepsilon, p)$ satisfies the equation

$$\Delta \eta(\varepsilon, p) = F(\varepsilon, p)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F(\varepsilon, p) = & 2(\omega + \eta(\varepsilon, p))_x \wedge (\omega + \eta(\varepsilon, p))_y - 2\omega_x \wedge \omega_y + l(\varepsilon, p) \cdot \Delta \tau - \alpha(\varepsilon, p) \mu^2 \\ & + 2\varepsilon H(\omega + p + \eta(\varepsilon, p)) (\omega + \eta(\varepsilon, p))_x \wedge (\omega + \eta(\varepsilon, p))_y \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $F(\varepsilon, p) \in L^{3/2}$ and, in view of (3.4) and (3.13), $F(\varepsilon, p) \rightarrow 0$ in $L^{3/2}$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ uniformly with respect to p , by regularity we have that

$$\eta(\varepsilon, p) \in W^{2,3/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta(\varepsilon, p) \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } W^{2,3/2}$$

hence, by Sobolev embeddings, $F(\varepsilon, p) \in L^3$ and $F(\varepsilon, p) \rightarrow 0$ in L^3 as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ uniformly with respect to p . Again by regularity

$$\eta(\varepsilon, p) \in W^{2,3} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta(\varepsilon, p) \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } W^{2,3}$$

hence $\eta(\varepsilon, p) \in C^{1,1/3}$ and

$$\eta(\varepsilon, p) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } C^{1,1/3} \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0 \text{ uniformly with respect to } p. \quad (3.14)$$

For any $\varepsilon \in (-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0)$, let us define the perturbed manifold

$$Z_\varepsilon := \{\omega + p + \eta(\varepsilon, p) : p \in \mathbb{R}^3\}.$$

From [7], we have that Z_ε is a natural constraint for $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon$, namely any critical point $p \in \mathbb{R}^3$ of the functional

$$\Phi_\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \Phi_\varepsilon(p) = \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon(\omega + p + \eta(\varepsilon, p))$$

gives rise to a critical point $u_\varepsilon = \omega + p + \eta(\varepsilon, p)$ of $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon$.

Proposition 3.3 *Assume $H \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$, $\nabla H \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$, and $\lim_{|p| \rightarrow \infty} H(p) = 0$. Then for any $|\varepsilon| < \varepsilon_0$*

$$\lim_{|p| \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_\varepsilon(p) = \text{const} = \mathcal{E}_0(\omega).$$

Proof. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_\varepsilon(p) &= \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon(\omega + p + \eta(\varepsilon, p)) = \mathcal{E}_0(\omega + p + \eta(\varepsilon, p)) + 2\varepsilon \mathcal{V}_H(\omega + p + \eta(\varepsilon, p)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \omega|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \eta(\varepsilon, p)|^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla \omega \cdot \nabla \eta(\varepsilon, p) \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (\omega + p + \eta(\varepsilon, p)) \cdot (\omega + \eta(\varepsilon, p))_x \wedge (\omega + \eta(\varepsilon, p))_y \\ &\quad + 2\varepsilon [\mathcal{V}_H(\omega + p) + \langle \mathcal{V}'_H(\omega + p), \eta(\varepsilon, p) \rangle + o(\|\eta(\varepsilon, p)\|_{W^{1,3}})] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \omega|^2 + \frac{2}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \omega \cdot \omega_x \wedge \omega_y + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \eta(\varepsilon, p)|^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla \omega \cdot \nabla \eta(\varepsilon, p) \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \omega \cdot (\omega_x \wedge \eta(\varepsilon, p)_y + \eta(\varepsilon, p)_x \wedge \omega_y) \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \omega \cdot \eta(\varepsilon, p)_x \wedge \eta(\varepsilon, p)_y + \frac{2}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta(\varepsilon, p) \cdot (\omega + \eta(\varepsilon, p))_x \wedge (\omega + \eta(\varepsilon, p))_y \\ &\quad + 2\varepsilon \mathcal{V}_H(\omega + p) + 2\varepsilon \langle \mathcal{V}'_H(\omega + p), \eta(\varepsilon, p) \rangle + 2\varepsilon o(\|\eta(\varepsilon, p)\|_{W^{1,3}}) \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

where we have used the fact that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} p \cdot u_x \wedge u_y = 0 \quad \forall p \in \mathbb{R}^3, \quad u \in W^{1,3},$$

(see [7], Lemma A.3). Notice that from Lemma 3.1 we have that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \eta(\varepsilon, p)|^2 \leq \sqrt[3]{4\pi} \|\eta(\varepsilon, p)\|_{W^{1,3}}^2 \xrightarrow{|p| \rightarrow \infty} 0, \quad (3.16)$$

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla \omega \cdot \nabla \eta(\varepsilon, p) \right| \leq \sqrt[6]{4\pi} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \omega|^2 \right)^{1/2} \|\eta(\varepsilon, p)\|_{W^{1,3}} \xrightarrow{|p| \rightarrow \infty} 0, \quad (3.17)$$

and, by the Hölder inequality and Lemma 3.1,

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \omega \cdot (\omega_x \wedge \eta(\varepsilon, p)_y + \eta(\varepsilon, p)_x \wedge \omega_y) \right| \leq 2 \|\omega\|_{W^{1,3}}^2 \|\eta(\varepsilon, p)\|_{W^{1,3}} \xrightarrow{|p| \rightarrow \infty} 0, \quad (3.18)$$

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \omega \cdot (\eta(\varepsilon, p)_x \wedge \eta(\varepsilon, p)_y) \right| \leq \|\omega\|_{W^{1,3}} \|\eta(\varepsilon, p)\|_{W^{1,3}}^2 \xrightarrow{|p| \rightarrow \infty} 0, \quad (3.19)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta(\varepsilon, p) \cdot (\omega + \eta(\varepsilon, p))_x \wedge (\omega + \eta(\varepsilon, p))_y \right| \\ \leq \|\omega + \eta(\varepsilon, p)\|_{W^{1,3}}^2 \|\eta(\varepsilon, p)\|_{W^{1,3}} \xrightarrow{|p| \rightarrow \infty} 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

Moreover the Gauss-Green Theorem yields

$$\mathcal{V}_H(\omega + p) = - \int_{B_1} H(\xi + p) d\xi$$

so that by the Dominated Convergence Theorem we have that

$$\lim_{|p| \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{V}_H(\omega + p) = 0. \quad (3.21)$$

From (2.3), Hölder inequality, and Lemma 3.1, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \mathcal{V}'_H(\omega + p), \eta(\varepsilon, p) \rangle| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} H(\omega + p) \eta(\varepsilon, p) \cdot \omega_x \wedge \omega_y \right| \\ &\leq \|H\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \|\omega\|_{W^{1,3}}^2 \|\eta(\varepsilon, p)\|_{W^{1,3}} \xrightarrow{|p| \rightarrow \infty} 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

From (3.15) - (3.22), it follows that

$$\lim_{|p| \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_\varepsilon(p) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \omega|^2 + \frac{2}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \omega \cdot \omega_x \wedge \omega_y = \mathcal{E}_0(\omega).$$

The proposition is thereby proved. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. As already observed at the beginning of Section 2, it is not restrictive to take $H_0 = 1$. From Proposition 3.3 it follows that for $|\varepsilon| < \varepsilon_0$ either Φ_ε is constant (and hence we have infinitely many critical points) or it has a global maximum or minimum point. In any case Φ_ε has a critical point. Since Z_ε is a natural constraint for $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon$, we deduce the existence of a critical point of $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon$ for $|\varepsilon| < \varepsilon_0$ and hence of a solution to (P_ε) . The H_ε -bubble ω_ε found in this way is of the form $\omega + p^\varepsilon + \eta(\varepsilon, p^\varepsilon)$ for some $p^\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^3$ where η is as in Lemma 3.1. Remark 3.2 yields that ω_ε is closed in $C^{1,1/3}(\mathbb{S}^2, \mathbb{R}^3)$ -norm to the manifold $\{\omega + p : p \in \mathbb{R}^3\}$ for ε small. Since ω has no branch points, we deduce that ω_ε has no branch points. $\square$

To prove Theorems 1.2 and 1.4, we need the following expansion for Φ_ε (see [7])

$$\Phi_\varepsilon(p) = \mathcal{E}_0(\omega) - 2\varepsilon\Gamma(p) + O(\varepsilon^2) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0 \text{ uniformly in } p \in \mathbb{R}^3. \quad (3.23)$$

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ small. Assumption (H4) implies that $\Gamma(0) > 0$ and hence from (3.23) we have that for ε small $\Phi_\varepsilon(0) < \mathcal{E}_0(\omega)$, whereas from assumption (H3) we have that $\text{Hess } \Gamma(0)$ is positive definite so that Γ has a strict local minimum in 0 and hence from (3.23) Φ_ε has a strict local maximum in $B_r(0)$ for some $r > 0$ such that $\Phi_\varepsilon(p) < \Phi_\varepsilon(0) - c_\varepsilon < \mathcal{E}_0(\omega)$ for $|p| = r$, where c_ε is some positive constant depending on ε . In particular Φ_ε has a mountain pass geometry. Moreover by Theorem 1.1 $\Phi_\varepsilon(p) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_0(\omega)$ as $|p| \rightarrow \infty$, and so Φ_ε must have a global minimum point. If the minimum point and the mountain pass point coincide then Φ_ε has infinitely many critical points. Otherwise Φ_ε has at least three critical points: a local maximum point, a global minimum point, and a mountain pass. If $\varepsilon < 0$ we find the inverse inequalities and hence we find that Φ_ε has a local minimum point, a global maximum point, and a mountain pass. As a consequence (P_ε) has at least three solutions provided ε is sufficiently small. $\square$

As observed in Remark 1.3, if $H_1(0) > 0$ and $\text{Hess } H_1(0)$ is positive definite, by continuity we have that for H_0 sufficiently large $\Gamma(0) > 0$ and $\text{Hess } \Gamma(0)$ is positive definite, so that we can still prove the existence of three solutions arguing as above.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Assumption (H5) implies that $\Gamma(p_1) > 0$ and $\Gamma(p_2) < 0$. Since $\Phi_\varepsilon(p) = \mathcal{E}_0(\omega) + 2\varepsilon(-\Gamma(p) + o(1))$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we have for ε sufficiently small

$$\Phi_\varepsilon(p_1) < \mathcal{E}_0(\omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_\varepsilon(p_2) > \mathcal{E}_0(\omega)$$

if $\varepsilon > 0$ and the inverse inequalities if $\varepsilon < 0$. Since by Theorem 1.1 $\Phi_\varepsilon(p) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_0(\omega)$ as $|p| \rightarrow \infty$, we conclude that Φ_ε must have a global maximum point and a global minimum point in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Since Z_ε is a natural constraint for $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon$, we deduce the existence of two critical points of $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon$ for $|\varepsilon|$ sufficiently small and hence of two solutions to (P_ε) . $\square$

As observed in Remark 1.5, if $H_1(p_1) > 0$ and $H_1(p_2) < 0$, by continuity we have that for H_0 sufficiently large $\Gamma(p_1) > 0$ and $\Gamma(p_2) < 0$, so that we can still prove the existence of two solutions arguing as above.

References

- [1] A. AMBROSETTI AND M. BADIALE: *Homoclinics: Poincaré-Melnikov type results via a variational approach*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, **15**(1998), 233-252.
- [2] A. AMBROSETTI AND M. BADIALE: *Variational perturbative methods and bifurcation of bound states from the essential spectrum*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A, **128**(1998), 1131-1161.
- [3] H. BREZIS AND J. M. CORON: *Multiple solutions of H -systems and Rellich's conjecture*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **37**(1984), 149-187.
- [4] H. BREZIS AND J. M. CORON: *Convergence of solutions of H -systems or how to blow bubbles*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal., **89**(1985), 21-56.
- [5] P. CALDIROLI AND R. MUSINA: *Existence of minimal H -bubbles*, Comm. Contemporary Math., **4**(2002), 177-210.
- [6] P. CALDIROLI AND R. MUSINA: *Existence of H -bubbles in a perturbative setting*, Rev. Mat. Iberoamer., to appear.
- [7] P. CALDIROLI AND R. MUSINA: *H -bubbles in a perturbative setting: the finite-dimensional reduction's method*, preprint SISSA, Trieste (2002).
- [8] S. CHANILLO AND A. MALCHIODI: *Asymptotic Morse theory for the equation $\Delta u = 2u_x \wedge u_y$* , preprint (2002).
- [9] M. GRÜTER: *Regularity of weak H -surfaces*, J. Reine Angew. Math., **329**(1981), 1-15.
- [10] S. HILDEBRANDT: *Randwertprobleme für Flächen mit vorgeschriebener mittlerer Krümmung und Anwendungen auf die Kapillaritätstheorie. I: Fest vorgegebener Rand*, Math. Z., **112**(1969), 205-213.
- [11] T. ISOBE: *On the asymptotic analysis of H -systems, I: asymptotic behavior of large solutions*, Adv. Diff. Eq., **6**(2001), 513-546.
- [12] N. JAKOBOWSKY: *A perturbation result concerning a second solution to the Dirichlet problem for the equation of the prescribed mean curvature*, J. Reine Angew. Math., **457**(1994), 1-21.
- [13] N. JAKOBOWSKY: *Multiple surfaces of non-constant mean curvature*, Math. Z., **217**(1994), 497-512.

- [14] K. Steffen: *On the existence of surfaces with prescribed mean curvature and boundary*, Math. Z., **146**(1976), 113-135.
- [15] M. STRUWE: *Large H -surface via the mountain-pass lemma*, Math. Ann., **270**(1985), 441-459.
- [16] M. STRUWE: “Plateau’s problem and the calculus of variations”, Mathematical Notes, 35. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1988.